

REMARKS

5 The Examiner had objected to the drawings because a descriptive textual label was considered to be necessary for various elements shown in the figures. Enclosed herewith are corrected drawings responding to the Examiner's objections on informal grounds.

10 The Examiner also objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) indicating that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Accordingly, the desktop calendar is now shown in Figure 1 and Figure 3.

15 Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully et al US Patent 4,831,552 in view of Koved et al US Patent 5,274,363. The Examiner in referring to Scully et al notes that this patentee teaches a calendar system connected to a network, and then goes on to read a number of elements of applicant's claim 1. However, the Examiner realizes that Scully et al does not specifically teach a video camera and a projector pointed at the first calendar. However, the Examiner states that Scully et al does teach a method of concurrently displaying entries from a plurality of electronic calendars based on an interactive system coupled to a network via a communications link 24 in which various serially connected communication links may be attached transparently to the system.

25 The Examiner then notes that Koved et al teaches an interactive display system which allows first and second display systems to interact with a large projection or input device coupled to the computer [note Figure 1 element 70; Figure 2A element S4 "pointing at large screen"; col. 1 lines 1-10; col. 2 lines 35-47; col.6 lines 15-18].

30 The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined Koved et al with Scully et al because Koved et al would have provided an alternative method [emphasis added] for the computer to print and/or display selected calendar entries from the plurality of calendars.


Applicant's position with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 is that the Examiner has not carried a burden of proof with respect to the scheme or system defined in applicant's claims, relying instead on vague "alternative methods." There is simply nothing in Koved et al teachings that is so manifestly related to the system of Scully et al that a person skilled in the art would be motivated or led to applicant's scheme, namely a scheme for ----- and practically what produces a complete calendar output in a simpler form, namely a paper or hard media form on which light images have been projected from multiple sources of data relating to calendar events.

However, in order to make it completely unequivocal the essential difference in applicant's scheme from one that is shown in the prior art, claim 1 has now been amended to express clearly the nature of the first calendar as a hard media calendar as will be seen in the figures of drawing labeled "paper calendar." Furthermore, the projector included with the video camera at the site of the hard media camera, namely camera 105 and projector 106. It pointed out the first calendar and thus has no counterpart anywhere in either of the references. To make it even clearer, the projector resides in claim 1 as defined for projecting light images thereon on the first calendar.

Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 are clearly allowable to applicant and, therefore, this application is in condition to be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

9-3-03



Paul D. Greeley, Reg. No. 31,019
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle
One Landmark Square - 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901